UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
Northern District of West Virginia

Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.				
Plaintiff(s)				
v.			Civil Action N	o. 1:22-cv-61
Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al.				
Defendant(s)				
JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL ACTION				
The cou	irt has ordered	that:		
☐ Judgment award ☐ Judgment costs		○ Other		
The Court concludes that Regeneron has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the				
other:	Defendants have infringed claims 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the '865 Patent; Regeneron has			
demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendants will induce infringement and 25 of the '572 Patent and claims 11 and 19 of the '601 Patent; (continued below)				_
			, (,
This action	on was:			
☐ tried by jury ☐ tried by judge ☐ decided by judge				

decided by Judge Thomas S. Kleeh

Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claims 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of the '865 Patent are anticipated or obvious in light of the prior art or invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of written description, lack of enablement, or indefiniteness. Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 6 of the '572 Patent is invalid as anticipated; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 6 of the '572 Patent is invalid as obvious; Mylan has not demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that claim 25 of the '572 patent is invalid as anticipated; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 11 of the '601 Patent is invalid as anticipated; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 11 of the '601 patent is invalid as obvious; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 11 of the '601 patent is invalid as obvious; Mylan has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 19 of the '601 Patent is invalid as obvious.

Date: December 27, 2023 Che

CLERK OF COURT
Cheryl Dean Riley
/s/ D. Kinsey